UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,093	04/20/2004	Jose Guadalupe Cid-Aguilar	206,507	6009
	7590 07/24/200 RAYNE & SCHWAB		EXAMINER	
666 THIRD AV	ENUE, 10TH FLOOR		BOLDEN, ELIZABETH A	
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		,093	CID-AGUILAR ET AL.	
		er	Art Unit	
	ELIZAB	ETH A. BOLDEN	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this com Period for Reply	nunication appears on t	he cover sheet with th	e correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIC WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM TH - Extensions of time may be available under the prov after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maxim - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	E MAILING DATE OF sions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no communication. In statutory period will apply and reply will, by statute, cause the anths after the mailing date of this	THIS COMMUNICATI event, however, may a reply be d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for application to become ABANDO	ON. The timely filed rom the mailing date of this one control (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status				
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condiction closed in accordance with the properties. 	2b)⊡ This action is tion for allowance exce	non-final. pt for formal matters,		ne merits is
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to result and the second sec	is/are withdrawn from o			
9) The specification is objected to be 10) The drawing(s) filed on is, Applicant may not request that any Replacement drawing sheet(s) included the control of the co	are: a) accepted or objection to the drawing(s ding the correction is requ	e) be held in abeyance. Suired if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a cl a) All b) Some * c) None of 1. Certified copies of the prio 2. Certified copies of the prio 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior copies of the certified copies of the prior copies of the prior copies of the prior copies of the certified	of: ority documents have be ority documents have be dies of the priority documentional Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Applic ments have been rece cule 17.2(a)).	ation No vived in this Nationa	l Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Reviolation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 8 April 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 11/182,449 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Drawings

The original drawings received on 20 April 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0114291 A1.

Koyama et al. teaches a glass composition having overlapping ranges of components and properties with instant claims 6-9. See Abstract and paragraphs [0031]-[0039], [0048]-[0050], and [0063].

Koyama et al. fails to teach any examples or ranges of components that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the instant claims. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges taught by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

One of ordinary skill in the art would expect that a glass with overlapping compositional ranges would have the property as recited in claim 6.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landa et al., U.S. Patent 7,169,722.

Landa et al. teaches a glass composition having overlapping ranges of components and properties with instant claims 6-9. See Abstract, column 2, lines 44-67, column 3, lines 1-36, column 4, lines 5-36, and column 7, lines 25-58.

Landa et al. fails to teach any examples or ranges of components that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the instant claims. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges taught by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

One of ordinary skill in the art would expect that a glass with overlapping compositional ranges would have the property as recited in claim 6.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue that Koyama et al. does not claim TiO_2 , however Koyama et al. does teach TiO_2 and the compositional ranges due overlap.

Applicants' argue that "The logical reason why Landa et al. issued as a patent and why applicants' glass also deserves patent protection..." is irrelevant since each patent application is evaluated on its own merits and the prosecution is not based on the prosecution history of other patent applications and issued patents.

Applicants' further argue the effects of components, cobalt and Cr₂O₃, as well as the valence state of TiO₂. This is not persuasive since there are no limitations in the claims that pertain to or restrict the presence of such components or require that TiO₂ be present in a specific valence state.

Art Unit: 1793

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH A. BOLDEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jerry A Lorengo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793 Elizabeth A. Bolden Examiner Art Unit 1793

EAB 18 July 2008 Application/Control Number: 10/829,093

Page 5

Art Unit: 1793